Timothy J. Lamb DELANEY WILES, INC. 1007 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 300 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 Phone: (907) 279-3581

Fax: (907) 277-1331 tjl@delaneywiles.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

CONOCOPHILLIPS ALASKA, INC.,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
FORREST WRIGHT; AMANDA WRIGHT;)
NATHAN KEAYS; KELLY KEAYS; ECO EDGE ARMORING, LLC; DAVID)
BENEFIELD; WRIGHT CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, LLC; and DB OILFIELD)
SUPPORT SERVICES)
Defendants.) Case No. 3:19-CV-00311-SLG

NOTICE OF RELATED CASE

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 16.1(e), ConocoPhillips hereby provides Notice of Related Case. On December 12, 2019, ConocoPhillips filed *ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc.*v. Forrest Wright; Amanda Wright; David Benefield; Wright Capital Investments, LLC; and DB Oilfield Support Services, Case No. 2:19-cv-02132, in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

DELANEY WILES, INC.
SUITE 300

1007 WEST 3RD AVENUE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
99501
(907) 279-3581

FAX (907) 277-1331

Notice of Related Case

ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc. v. Forrest Wright et al., Case No. 3:19-CV-00311-SLG

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:19-cv-00311-SLG

Document 29 Filed 12/23/19 Page 1 of 3

The Nevada case is based on the same set of operative facts. As detailed in the complaints in both cases, Forrest Wright and Amanda Wright used funds embezzled from ConocoPhillips to purchase real estate in Nevada. The real estate is held in the name of Wright Capital Investments, LLC. The case in Nevada was filed to allow ConocoPhillips to assert *Lis Pendens* against that real estate.

Plaintiff anticipates filing a motion to consolidate both matters into one case under the jurisdiction of the District of Alaska.

DATED this 23rd day of December, 2019.

DELANEY WILES, INC. Attorneys for ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc.

s/Timothy J. Lamb

Timothy J. Lamb, Alaska Bar No.: 8409080 DELANEY WILES, INC. 1007 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 300 Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Phone: (907) 279-3581 Fax: (907) 277-1331 tjl@delaneywiles.com

U.CERTIFICATE.OF.SER VICE. COLOR CALCEOTICS OF INTERING HAVE OCCUPATED ON SUCH

category is referred to as "black listing." According to this technique, messages from senders known to be distributors of unsolicited e-mails are automatically designated as undesirable, and are not passed along to the recipient as legitimate e-mail. Black list services automatically update the black list, and in some systems a user may also add names to the black list. While these techniques work well, they are often circumvented by repeated changes in originating addresses.

[0007] Heuristic techniques apply rules to characteristics found in analyzed messages to determine whether they are spam. Instances or combinations of particular terms in an e-mail and other criteria often result in a positive indication that the message is spam. These techniques are also helpful but can result in "false positives" – instances where e-mails are wrongly determined to be spam.

[0008] To help alleviate the false positive problem, "white list" techniques have been developed. These schemes maintain a list of senders that are known to be approved by the sender. This helps minimize the false positives problem somewhat, but also burdens the user with having to maintain the white list. Users quickly tire to the addition of senders to the white list. To help automate the maintenance of the white list, a confirmation technique has been used. There, a sender is sent a return e-mail requesting a second confirmation message from the sender before allowing message delivery. The rationale behind this scheme is that many automated spamming processes will not respond with a confirmation message. However, many legitimate senders also do not respond to the request for confirmation. Thus, with various conventional white list techniques, there are often messages that are erroneously determined to be unsolicited spam.

[0009] Another problem with e-mail management, particularly with system that implement an Internet based mail server that is variously accessible by the user, is accommodating access to e-mails that have already been downloaded and deleted from a mail server pursuant to access by the user. This may arise in various circumstances, such as where the user accesses the message from the office, then realizes that they may want to access the email from another location at a later time. While the message could simply be manually forwarded by the user to their own e-mail address, this can be cumbersome, can be hampered by errors in